

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

<b>ADRIAN D. MADDOX,</b>	)	<b>CASE NO. 1:12 CV 1828</b>
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>JUDGE DONALD C. NUGENT</b>
	)	
<b>CITY OF SHAKER HEIGHTS, OHIO, et al.,)</b>	)	<b>Magistrate Judge William H. Baughman, Jr,</b>
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	<b>ORDER ON MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S</b>
	)	<b><u>REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION</u></b>

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation issued by Magistrate Judge William H. Baughman, Jr. (Docket #36), recommending that the Plaintiff, Adrian Maddox's Motion to Amend Complaint (Docket #23) be granted and that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration of Ruling on Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Docket #35) be denied.

On December 3, 2013, Plaintiff filed a Motion in Opposition to Report and Recommendation. (Docket #39.) On December 9, 2013, Defendants filed a Motion Opposing Plaintiff's Motion in Opposition to Report and Recommendation of Magistrate. (Docket #40.)

**Standard of Review for a Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation**

The applicable district court standard of review for a magistrate judge's report and recommendation depends upon whether objections were made to the report. When objections are made to a report and recommendation of a magistrate judge, the district court reviews the

case *de novo*. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b) provides:

The district judge must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

### **Conclusion**

This Court carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and the objections filed by the Parties and finds the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge to be well-reasoned and correct. The Court hereby agrees with and adopts the findings of the Magistrate Judge as its own.

The Report and Recommendation issued by Magistrate Judge Baughman (Document #36) is hereby ADOPTED. Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Complaint (Docket #23) is hereby GRANTED. Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider (Docket #35) is hereby DENIED.

This case remains referred to Magistrate Judge Baughman for pretrial supervision.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

  
DONALD C. NUGENT  
United States District Judge

DATED: December 16, 2013